

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 7, 2004 the Examiner noted that claims 1-17 were pending and rejected claims 1-17. New claim 18 has been added so that claims 1-18 are pending for reconsideration. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by McKeehan.

The present invention is directed to a system that includes a component base. A component base includes components or program units that can be combined to perform a desired set of operations of an application program. The component base includes an object managing method. An object managing method is a way of performing something, such as a way of accessing a database, a way of accessing a transaction, a way of communicating, etc. Different access targets or objects require different ways of accessing the target. For example, accessing a database target or object is different from accessing a telephone call transaction object on a telephone switch. That is, the object managing method is like an algorithm and each component may need a different object managing method. In the present invention plural object managing methods exist, essentially a method or algorithm for each of the components or targets. The present invention selects an object managing method for a particular component or application program unit or object caching part that is to be placed into the component base. With a new object caching part or component in the base, the new or selected managing method must also be included. To do this, the present invention switches or substitutes the needed method (corresponding to the component) for a method that is in the base. That is, the component base is updated to include a new component and to include a method corresponding to the new component or programming unit so that the target or object can be accessed by the corresponding component.

The Teachings of McKeehan are very different from the present invention.

The Examiner points to McKeehan suggesting a comparison between the invention and the CasheManager and the PersistentContainer of McKeehan. For the Examiners comparison to be appropriate there must be plural CacheManagers each of which would have to correspond to an object caching part as called for in the invention. There is no disclosure (or suggestion) in McKeehan that there be plural such CacheManagers. In addition, there is no disclosure (or suggestion) concerning switching or substituting CacheManagers as is also called for in the present invention. McKeehan is associated with preparing a plurality of PersistentContainers allegedly corresponding to the object persistence processing part of the present claimed

invention. However, there is no disclosure (or suggestion) concerning switching or substituting one PersistentContainer for another in McKeehan. Further, McKeehan uses the word "method" in a very different context than the present invention. The word method in McKeehan refers to a function associated with a class in an object oriented system. A class is an entity from which spanned objects are spawned. That is, a method in McKeehan is a function that is used by a number of different objects. This is very different from the present invention where a method corresponds to a particular component and not several components. Thus, it is submitted that the comparison of McKeehan with the present invention is misplaced.

It is submitted that the selecting and switching of an object managing method that includes an external storage accessing method in a manner corresponding to the type of each component as recited in the present invention is not taught or suggested by McKeehan.

It is submitted that the present claimed invention patentably distinguishes over McKeehan and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

New claim 18 emphasizes that the selection of an object managing method for an application program unit automatically configures a persistent object cache and a persistent object process that allows a persistent object of the program unit to communicate through the cache to storage. The prior art does not teach or suggest this.

It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/6/14

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501